

Appl. No. 10/025,922
Amdt. Dated: October 13, 2004

REMARKS

By filing the Request for Re-examination, the amendment submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 22, 2003 is believed to be entered.

The Examiner has noted in his Advisory Action dated June 25, 2004 that the reference to Cook indicated that one of the objectives is to maintain the bridging position of the lip as the deck is lowered. As explained by the Applicants in the previous responses, Cook does not disclose a structure that achieves that objective independently of the position of the deck.

The operation of the lip support mechanism is shown in Figure 9 and will clearly have the effect of allowing movement of the lip as the deck is lowered. Therefore, although an objective is to maintain the lip extended, the disclosure does not show such an operation as interpreted by the Examiner.

The Applicants achieve this objective through the provision of the latch as recited in claim 1 and 16 that is separate from the lip operating mechanism which is not taught in Cook.

Further action to allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John R.S. Orange
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 29,725

Date: October 13, 2004

Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP
P.O. Box 25
Commerce Court West
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9, Canada

Tel: (416) 863-2400
JRO/sp